

areas such as sanctuaries, fish and wildlife management areas, hatcheries, and refuges, and other aquatic sites such as floodplains, wetlands, mudflats, vegetated shallows, coral reefs, riffles and pools, and springs and seeps.

### 3. Impact Assessment Principles

a. Changes in fish and wildlife productivity or ecosystem structure and function may not result in a biologically adverse impact. The determination as to whether a biological change constitutes an adverse impact for which mitigation should be recommended is the responsibility of the Service and other involved Federal and State resource agencies.

b. The net biological impact of a development proposal (or alternatives) is the difference in predicted biological conditions between the future with the action and the future without the action. If the future without the action cannot be reasonably predicted and documented by the project sponsor, then the Service analysis should be based on biological conditions that would be expected to exist over the planning period due to natural species succession or implementation of approved restoration/improvement plans or conditions which currently exist in the planning area.

c. Service review of project impacts will consider, whenever practicable:

(1) The total long-term biological impact of the project, including any secondary or indirect impacts regardless of location; and (2) any cumulative effects when viewed in the context of existing or anticipated projects.

d. The *Habitat Evaluation Procedures* will be used by the Service as a basic tool for evaluating project impacts and as a basis for formulating subsequent recommendations for mitigation subject to the exemptions in the *Ecological Services Manual* (100 ESM 1). When the *Habitat Evaluation Procedures* do not apply, then other evaluation systems may be used provided such use conforms with policies provided herein.

e. In those cases where instream flows are an important determinant of habitat value, consideration should be given to the use of the Service's *Instream Flow Incremental Methodology* to develop instream flow mitigation recommendations, where appropriate.

f. Where specific impact evaluation methods or mitigation technologies are not available, Service employees shall continue to apply their best professional judgment to develop mitigation recommendations.

### 4. Mitigation Recommendations

a. The Service may recommend support of projects or other proposals when the following criteria are met:

(1) They are ecologically sound;

(2) The least environmentally damaging reasonable alternative is selected;

(3) Every reasonable effort is made to avoid or minimize damage or loss of fish and wildlife resources and uses;

(4) All important recommended means and measures have been adopted with guaranteed implementation to satisfactorily compensate for unavoidable damage or loss consistent with the appropriate mitigation goal; and

(5) For wetlands and shallow water habitats, the proposed activity is clearly water dependent and there is a demonstrated public need.

The Service may recommend the "no project" alternative for those projects or other proposals that do not meet all of the above criteria and where there is likely to be a significant fish and wildlife resource loss.

b. Recommendations will be presented by the Service at the earliest possible stage of project planning to assure maximum consideration. The Service will strive to provide mitigation recommendations that represent the best judgment of the Service, including consideration of cost, on the most effective means and measures of satisfactorily achieving the mitigation planning goal. Such recommendations will be developed in cooperation with the Federal action agency or private developer responsible for the project, whenever practicable, and will place heavy reliance on cost estimates provided by that Federal action agency or private developer.

c. The Service will recommend that the Federal action agency include designated funds for all fish and wildlife resource mitigation (including, but not limited to, Service investigation costs, initial development costs and continuing operation, maintenance, replacement, and administrative costs) as part of the initial and any alternative project plans and that mitigation funds (as authorized and appropriated by Congress for Federal projects) be spent concurrently and proportionately with overall project construction and operation funds throughout the life of the project.

**Note.**—Prevention of losses may necessitate expenditure of funds at an earlier stage of project planning. This is acceptable and preferred.

d. Service mitigation recommendations will be made under an explicit expectation that these means and measures: (1) would be the ultimate

responsibility of the appropriate Federal action agency to implement or enforce; and (2) would provide for a duration of effectiveness for the life of the project plus such additional time required for the adverse effects of an abandoned project to cease to occur.

e. Land acquisition in fee title for the purpose of compensation will be recommended by the Service *only* under one or more of the following three conditions:

(1) When a change in ownership is necessary to guarantee the future conservation of the fish and wildlife resource consistent with the mitigation goal for the specific project area; or

(2) When other means and measures for mitigation (see Section 5 below) will not compensate habitat losses consistent with the mitigation goal for the specific project area; or

(3) When land acquisition in fee title is the most cost-effective means that may partially or completely achieve the mitigation goal for the specific project area.

Service recommendations for fee title land acquisition will seek to identify mitigation lands with marginal economic potential.

f. First priority will be given to recommendation of a mitigation site within the planning area. Second priority will be given to recommendation of a mitigation site in proximity to the planning area within the same ecoregion section. Third priority will be given to recommendation of a mitigation site elsewhere within the same ecoregion section.

g. Service personnel will fully support a variety of uses on mitigation lands where such uses are compatible with dominant fish and wildlife uses and, for Federal wildlife refuges, are consistent with the provisions of the Refuge Recreation Act and the National Wildlife Refuge Administration Act. However, it may be in the best public interest to recommend limiting certain uses that would significantly decrease habitat value for species of high public interest. In such cases, the Service may recommend against such incompatible uses.

h. Measures to increase recreation values will not be recommended by Service personnel to compensate for losses of habitat value. Recreation use losses not restored through habitat value mitigation will be addressed through separate and distinct recommended measures to offset those specific losses.

i. The guidelines contained in this policy do not apply to threatened or endangered species. However, where both habitat and endangered or threatened species impacts are involved,